

U.S.S.N. 10/647,979  
Docket No. 133976-1

## REMARKS

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by US 5,705,713 to Chambers, *et al.* It is believed that the rejection is now moot, as claim 16 is cancelled herewith, and claim 24 is amended to depend from claim 18.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16, 18, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Chambers and US Patent No. 5,264,570 to Johnson, *et al.*


Chambers teaches a process for preparation of fluoro compounds wherein a compound of formula  $R^1R^2CHOX$  is converted to its fluorinated analog (col. 1, lines 65-clo. 2, line 5). The product may be "separated, e.g. by filtration, and purified in the usual way" (col. 4, lines 55-65). Example 1 describes a preparation of 2-fluoro-1,3,5-tri-O-benzoyl- $\alpha$ -D-ribofuranose wherein the product is precipitated from the reaction mixture without further purification. Johnson relates to a method for synthesizing 2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose by contacting 1,2,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl-2-O-trifluoromethanesulfonyl-2-deoxy- $\beta$ -D-mannose with  $^{18}F$  ion and deprotecting (col. 2, lines 55-67).

Claim 18 is now amended to specify that the imaging agent has "solubility of the imaging agent differentiates it from the compound", and that the imaging agent is separated from the compound via that "differential solubility". Neither Chambers nor Johnson mentions using differential solubility to separate the starting material from the fluorinated product, or describe any process for doing so. In fact, the need for an improved method for purifying the product is not recognized in either reference. Accordingly, combining the references would not result in the claimed method. Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case has not been established with respect to the claims as amended. It is believed that the rejection is overcome.

U.S.S.N. 10/647,979  
Docket No. 133976-1

Entry of the amendments and reconsideration of claims 18, 20 and 24 in light of the above remarks is respectfully requested. Examiner Schlientz is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions or comments concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Mary Louise Gioeni  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 41,779

Dated: August 29, 2007

General Electric Company  
GE Global Research  
1 Research Circle  
Niskayuna, NY 12309  
Phone (518) 387-6648  
Fax (518) 387-7751